

REMARKS

These remarks follow the order of the paragraphs of the office action. Relevant portions of the office action are shown indented and italicized.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications through the applicants application filed on April 1, 2004.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. IDS submitted April 1, 2004 has been considered by examiner. A signed and initiated copy is attached hereto.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1-4, 14-17 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1 recites "The Xpath is partially established with respect to a given XML event". Examiner believes it is a typing typo and suggests the "with" should be changed to "with" or appropriate correction. Appropriate correction is required.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 1 is amended to replace the 'with' with the word 'with'. This overcomes the objection to Claims 1-4, 14-17.

Claim Rejections -35 USC §112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112: The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "a computer to effect the functions of claim 5 in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purpose of examination, the examiner presumes the phrase should read, a computer to effect the Xpath evaluating apparatus of claim 5".

1 In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 18 is amended to replace the word
2 'functions' with the words 'Xpath evaluating apparatus'. This overcomes the rejection to Claim 18
3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

4 *Clam 19 recites the limitation "a computer to effect the functions of claim 8 "in line 6.*
5 *There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purpose of*
6 *examination, the examiner presumes the phrase should read, a computer to effect the*
7 *Xpath evaluating apparatus of claim 8.*

8 In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 19 is amended to replace the word
9 'functions' with the words 'Xpath evaluating apparatus'. This overcomes the rejection to Claim 19
10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

11 *Claim 20 recites the limitation "a computer to effect the functions of claim 10" in line 6,*
12 *There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purpose of*
13 *examination, the examiner presumes the phrase should read, "a computer to effect the*
14 *information processing apparatus of claim 10".*

15 In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 20 is amended to replace the word
16 'functions' with the words 'information processing apparatus'. This overcomes the rejection to
17 Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

18 ***Claim Rejections -35 USC §101***

19 *5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows: Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful*
20 *process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful*
21 *improvement thereof, may obtain a patent thereto,, subject to the conditions and*
22 *requirements of this title.*

23 *Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed*
24 *to non-statutory subject matter.*

25 *The claims 5-13 recite the limitations of an apparatus. However, the claims lack*
26 *necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the*
27 *meaning of 35 USC 101. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are,*
28 *at best, functional descriptive material per se.*

In response, the applicants respectfully state that Claims 5-13 are amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, so that each claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter.

The claim 14 recites the limitation of "a program for controlling a computer to evaluate the Xpath". The program is software per se. The software claims cannot be patented.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that claim 14 is amended to include the program is embodied in a tangible computer readable medium, and employed, so that the claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter. This overcomes the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections -35 USC § 102

*6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action: A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
(a) the Invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication In his or a foreign country. before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.*

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Peng et al. (Xpath Queries on Streaming Data, International Conference on Management of Data, Proceedings of the 2003 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data, published on June 9-12, 2003).

In response, the applicant respectfully states that Claims 1 - 20 are apparently not anticipated by the invention of Peng. The present invention, claimed in Claims 1 - 20, provides:

"[A]n XML parser for inputting XML event strings which constitute an XML document to be processed, and an XPath evaluating unit for executing evaluation of the XPath by streaming processing are provided. This XPath evaluating unit serially evaluates the XPath with respect to the respective XML events transferred from the XML parser, and retains information concerning a result of partial evaluation of this XPath when the XPath is partially established for a given XML event. Then, when the last step of this XPath is established, the XPath is judged as established for the XML document.

1 Thus the present invention is concerned with XML parsing for inputting XML event strings. It
2 serially evaluates the XPath with respect to the respective XML events transferred from the XML
3 parser.

4 Whereas, the cited art to Peng, Article entitled: "Xpath Queries on Streaming Data". The Peng
5 abstract reads:

6 We present the design and implementation of the XSQ system for querying streaming
7 XML data using XPath 1.0. Using a clean design based on a hierarchical arrangement of
8 pushdown transducers augmented with buffers, XSQ supports features such as multiple
9 predicates, closures, and aggregation. XSQ not only provides high throughput, but is also
10 memory efficient: It buffers only data that must be buffered by any streaming XPath
11 processor. We also present an empirical study of the performance characteristics of XPath
12 features, as embodied by XSQ and several other systems.

13 Thus, Peng is concerned with design and implementation of the XSQ system for querying
14 streaming XML data using XPath 1.0. Although Peng does parsing, evaluating etc., Peng is not
15 concerned parsing when serially evaluating the XPath with respect to the respective XML events
16 transferred from the XML parser. Examiner is apparently using personal knowledge to use and
17 form elements into Peng that do not exist, automaton etc., that were not alluded to and were not a
18 concern to Peng. Thus claims 1-20 are not anticipated by Pang, and are allowable.

19 *With respect to claim 1, Peng discloses an extensible-markup-language Path Language*
20 *(XPath) evaluating method for evaluating the XPath relevant to an extensible-*
21 *markup-language (XML) document by use of a computer, the Xpath evaluating method*
22 *comprising:*

23 In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is taken with the alleged equivalencies
24 of the elements of claim 1 and Peng. Firstly, a review of Peng is not concerned with, does not
25 allude to or anticipate and fails to "discloses an extensible-markup-language Path Language
26 (XPath) evaluating method for evaluating the XPath relevant to an extensible- markup-language
27 (XML) document by use of a computer." The first sentence of the second paragraph of Peng
28 reads, "[W]e address the problem of evaluating XPath queries over streaming XML [23]. Claims
29 1-20 are not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "evaluating XPath queries."

Claim 1 is an XPath evaluating method for evaluating an XPath while subjecting an XML document to streaming processing. Peng does 'evaluating', but does not allude and does not present an 'evaluating method'. Claim 1 reads:

1. (Currently amended) An extensible-markup-language Path Language (XPath) evaluating method comprising evaluating the XPath relevant to an extensible-markup-language (XML) document by use of a computer, the step of evaluating XPath comprising:

a first step of serially inputting XML event strings constituting an XML document to be processed;

a second step of serially evaluating the XPath respectively relevant to the inputted XML events while subjecting the XML document to streaming processing and retaining information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath in given storing means when the XPath is partially established with respect to a given XML event; and

a third step of repeating the partial evaluation of the XPath along with the input of the XML event strings while considering the result of the partial evaluation retained in the storing means and evaluating that the XPath is established with respect to the XML document when the last part of the XPath is established.

Peng does not allude to or anticipate "evaluating the XPath relevant to an extensible-markup-language (XML) document."

The office communication continues:

a first step of serially inputting XML event strings constituting an XML document to be processed (page 433, 2nd paragraph of [2.1]. 1st paragraph of [3.1], "accepts XML streams" which is "sequence of SAX events");

Applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency. Pang, page 433, 2nd paragraph of [2.1] reads:

"The streaming XML data is modeled as a sequence of SAX events, extended with the depth of the event. That is, an XML stream is a sequence $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n, \dots\}$ where $e_i \in E$."

Pang, page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.1], reads:

"First we introduce a PDA that accepts XML streams that have certain string. Figure 4(a) shows the state transition diagram of a PDA that accepts the XML stream in Figure 1. Text events that are not shown in the diagram map to self-transitions."

These citations are not anticipation of a step of "serially inputting XML event strings constituting an XML document to be processed."

The office communication continues:

a second step of serially evaluating the XPath respectively relevant to the inputted XML events (page 433, 1st of [3.]) and retaining information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath in given storing means when the XPath is partially established with respect to a given XML event (example 1 and last paragraph of page 432, when author element in input stream is encountered, Xpath is evaluated, and it satisfied the path /pub/book/author. However, book element, author elements are buffered to wait for later input stream events process); and

Applicants respectfully state that exception is taken with the office communication statement. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency. Pang, page 433, 1st of [3. reads:

"A pushdown transducer (PDT) is a pushdown automaton (PDA) with actions defined along with the transition arcs on the automaton. It has a finite set of states which includes a start state and a set of final states, a set of input symbols, and a set of stack symbols. At each step, it fetches an input symbol from the input sequence. Based on the input symbol and the symbols in the stack, it changes the current state and operates the stack according to the transition function. Besides the state transition and stack operation, the transition function also defines an output operation which could generate some output during the transition. Note that traditional PDTs do not have an extra buffer and the operations for the buffer. However, as discussed in Section 1, evaluating XPath queries over XML streams requires buffering potential results.

Also, Example 1, makes no allusion to the second step "serially evaluating the XPath respectively relevant to the inputted XML events while subjecting the XML document to streaming processing and retaining information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath in given storing means when the XPath is partially established ~~with~~ with respect to a given XML event."

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "serially evaluating" anything. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "inputted XML events while subjecting the XML document to streaming processing."

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "retaining information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath."

Peng is not concerned when any "XPath is partially established with respect to a given XML event. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate the 2nd step.

Thus, Peng fails to anticipate this step either.

The office communication continues:

a third step of repeating the partial evaluation of the Xpath along with the input of the XML event strings while considering the result of the partial evaluation retained in the storing means and evaluating that the XPath is established with respect to the XML document when the Last part of the XPath is established (example 1 and last paragraph of page 432, along with the input stream of events like price, author,...end of second book, evaluating the Xpath "/pub[year=2000]/book[price<11]/author" is established).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency. Pang, example 1, starts with and reads:

EXAMPLE 1. Consider the following query for the XML data in Figure 1:

/pvMryear=2002J/bookrpriceC1J/at~thor. This is not related to the this 3rd step.

1 Pang, last paragraph of page 432, reads:

2 "As suggested by the example, we need to solve the following problems in order to evaluate
3 even this relatively simple query. First, we may encounter data that is potentially in the result be-
4 fore we encounter the items required to evaluate the predicates to decide its membership. We
5 need to buffer the potential result items. Second, items in the buffer have to be marked separately
6 so that, after the evaluation of a predicate, we can process only the items that are affected by the
7 predicate. Third, we have to encode the logic of the predicates in the automaton. In the above
8 example, only when all the price children fail to satisfy the predicate (and we reach the end of the
9 book element) does the book element fail to satisfy the predicate. In the mean time, if one of the
10 children satisfies the predicate, we should know that the predicate is true and perform the
11 operations accordingly. Finally, predicates access different portions of the data. Some should be
12 evaluated when the begin tag is encountered, while others should be evaluated upon encountering
13 the text content. There are other forms of predicates, which will be ... "

14 So, neither of referenced Pang portions are concerned with, do not allude to and do not anticipate
15 this third step. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate any "partial
16 evaluation."

17 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "evaluation of the XPath along with
18 the input of the XML event strings."

19 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "considering the result of the partial
20 evaluation retained in the storing means."

21 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "evaluating that the XPath is
22 established with respect to the XML document when the last part of the XPath is established."

23 Peng is certainly not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a "step of repeating the
24 partial evaluation of the XPath along with the input of the XML event strings while considering

the result of the partial evaluation retained in the storing means and evaluating that the XPath is established with respect to the XML document when the last part of the XPath is established.

Thus Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate the steps of claim 1, and claim 1 and all claims that depend on claim 1 are allowable over the cited art.

Claim 2 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Peng teaches the Xpath evaluating method wherein the second step includes the steps of: generating an automaton for expressing the XPath to be evaluated (page 432, 6th paragraph of column 1, generate the hierarchical pushdown automaton corresponding to an XPath query); and evaluating the Xpath partially by allowing transition of a state of the automaton based on inputted respective XML events and retaining a result of the partial evaluation as the state of the automaton (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.]).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 1. Peng also is also not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 2, which reads:

2. The XPath evaluating method according to claim 1,
wherein the second step includes the steps of:
generating an automaton for expressing the XPath to be evaluated; and
evaluating the XPath partially by allowing transition of a state of the automaton
based on inputted respective XML events and retaining a result of the partial evaluation as
the state of the automaton.

Peng does not have an Xpath evaluating method. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency. Pang, (page 432, 6th paragraph of column 1, apparently does not allude to "generate the hierarchical pushdown automaton corresponding to an XPath query."

Pang reads:

- All the methods described in this paper are fully implemented in the XSQ system, which will be released under the GNU GPL license. In addition to serving as a testbed for further work on this topic, our system should be useful to anyone building systems for languages that include XPath (e.g., XQuery, XSLT).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In the rest of this section, we use examples to highlight some of the difficulties in evaluating XPath queries over XML streams. Some preliminaries, including the SAX data model and the XPath language, are covered in Section 2. The design of a basic pushdown transducer (BPDT), which corresponds to an XPath location step, is presented in Section 3. Section 4 describes our method for composing BPDTs to generate the hierarchical pushdown automaton (HPDT) corresponding to an XPath query. Related work is summarized Section 5. Section 6 presents some results from our empirical study of XSQ and related systems. We conclude in Section 7."

This doesn't mention 'automaton' or "generating an automaton for expressing the XPath to be evaluated."

Pang (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.]), copied above, does not allude to or anticipate a step of "evaluating the Xpath partially by allowing transition of a state of the automaton based on inputted respective XML events and retaining a result of the partial evaluation as the state of the automaton." Thus claim 2 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 1.

Claim 3 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Peng discloses the Xpath evaluating method wherein the second step includes the steps of: generating a first stack which expresses the Xpath to be evaluated with a string of stack elements (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.], "a set of stack symbols"); and generating a second stack for analyzing a nested structure of the XML document ("a set of input symbols") to be processed based on respective inputted XML events and then evaluating the XPath partially by comparing the first stack with the second stack (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.], lines 5-10).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 1. Peng also is also not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 3. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a step of "generating a first stack which expresses the XPath to be evaluated with a string of stack elements."

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a step of "generating a second stack for analyzing a nested structure of the XML document to be processed based on respective inputted XML events and then evaluating the XPath partially by comparing the first stack with the second stack."

Thus claim 3 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 1.

Claim 4 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 1 and furthermore Peng teaches the Xpath evaluating method wherein the second step includes the steps of: serially constructing a document tree indicating a document structure of the XML document to be processed based on input of respective XML events (page 436, 1st paragraph of [4.], "hierarchical pushdown transducer (HPDT), in form of a binary tree; figure 11 and 1st paragraph of [4.2], build an HPDT from an Xpath query); and evaluating the XPath along with construction of the document tree by use of the document tree including a part which has been constructed (figures 5-11, and example 5, page 436, 1st of [4.2]).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 1, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 4. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a step of "serially constructing a document tree indicating a document structure of the XML document to be processed based on input of respective XML events."

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a step of "evaluating the XPath along with construction of the document tree by use of the document tree including a part which has been constructed.

Thus claim 4 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 1.

1 *With respect to claim 5, Pang discloses an XPath evaluating apparatus comprising: an*
2 *evaluation executing unit for inputting XML event strings constituting an XML document*
3 *and serially evaluating the XPath with respect to each of XML events! while retaining*
4 *information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath when the XPath is*
5 *partially established with respect to a given XML event, and evaluating that the XPath is*
6 *established with respect to the XML document when the last step of the XPath is*
7 *established (page 433, 1st of [3], "Basic Pushdown Transducer"); and an XML event*
8 *transferring unit for inputting the XML event strings constituting the XML document to*
9 *be processed and serially transferring the XML event strings to the evaluation executing*
10 *unit (page 433. [2.1], "SAX parser").*

11 In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office
12 communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does
13 not allude to or anticipate Claim 1, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also not
14 concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 5. Claim 5 is an apparatus claim equivalent
15 of method claim 1. As with claim 1, a review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged
16 equivalency.

17 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate an element of " an evaluation
18 executing unit" or an XML event transferring unit as in claim 5. Thus claim 5 is allowable over
19 Peng.

20 *Claim 6 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 5 and furthermore*
21 *Peng teaches the XPath evaluating apparatus, further comprising: an automaton*
22 *generating unit for generating an automaton which expresses the XPath to be evaluated*
23 *(page 433, 1st of [3], "pushdown transducer"), wherein the evaluation executing unit*
24 *performs partial evaluation of the XPath by allowing a state of the automaton generated*
25 *by the automaton generating unit to perform transition based on the XML events*
26 *transferred from the XML event transferring unit, and retains a result of the partial*
27 *evaluation as the state of the automaton (page 433 1st paragraph of [3.]).*

28 In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office
29 communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does
30 not allude to or anticipate Claim 1. Peng also is also not concerned with, does not allude to or
31 anticipate Claims 5 or 6. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate an element of an automaton generating unit as in claim 6.

Thus claim 6 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 5.

Claim 7 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 5 and furthermore Peng teaches the Xpath evaluating apparatus, further comprising: a stack generating unit for generating a first stack which expresses the XPath to be evaluated with a string of stack elements (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.], "a set of stack symbols"), wherein the evaluation executing unit performs partial evaluation of the XPath by generating a second stack for analyzing a nested structure of the XML document subject to processing based on the XML events transferred from the XML event transferring unit and then comparing the first stack generated by the stack generating unit with the second stack (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.]. [3.1]).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 1, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 7. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate an element of a stack generating unit for generating a first stack which expresses the XPath to be evaluated with a string of stack element. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate an "evaluation executing unit performs partial evaluation of the XPath by generating a second stack for analyzing a nested structure of the XML document subject to processing based on the XML events transferred from the XML event transferring unit and then comparing the first stack generated by the stack generating unit with the second stack."

Thus claim 7 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 5.

With respect to claim 8, Peng teaches an Xpath evaluating apparatus comprising: a document tree constructing unit for inputting XML event strings which constitute an XML document and serially constructing a document tree indicating a document structure of

1 *the XML document based on inputted XML events along with the input of the respective*
2 *XML events (page 434, [3.2], "building the BPDT with figure 5-9); an XML event*
3 *transferring unit for inputting the XML event strings which constitute the XML document*
4 *to be processed and serially transferring the XML event strings to the document tree*
5 *constructing unit (page 433. [2.1]. "SAX parser"); and an evaluation executing unit for*
6 *evaluating the XPath along with construction of the document tree by the document tree*
7 *constructing unit, using the document tree with a part which has been constructed (page*
8 *436, 1st paragraph of [4.]. "hierarchical pushdown transducer (HPDT), in form of a*
9 *binary tree"; figure 11, and 1st paragraph of [4.2], build an HPDT from an Xpath*
10 *query).*

11 In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office
12 communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does
13 not allude to or anticipate Claim 1, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also not
14 concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 8. A review of the referenced portions fail
15 to show the alleged equivalency.

16 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate an "XPath evaluating apparatus of
17 claim 8. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "a document tree
18 constructing unit, for inputting XML event strings which constitute an XML document and
19 serially constructing a document tree indicating a document structure of the XML document
20 based on inputted XML events along with the input of the respective XML events while
21 subjecting the XML document to streaming processing."

22 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate "an XML event transferring unit"
23 "employed for inputting the XML event strings which constitute the XML document to be
24 processed and serially transferring the XML event strings to the document tree constructing unit.

25 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate the evaluation executing unit of claim
26 8. Thus claim 8 is allowable over Peng.

27 ***Claim 9** is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 8 and furthermore*
28 *Peng teaches the XPath evaluating apparatus, wherein the evaluation executing unit*
29 *retains information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath when the*

1 *XPath is partially established upon the evaluation of the XPath using the document tree*
2 *(page 434, [3.3], "Buffer operation in BPDT").*

3 In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office
4 communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does
5 not allude to or anticipate Claims 1 and 8, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also
6 not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 9. A review of the referenced portions
7 fail to show the alleged equivalency.

8 Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a limitation "wherein the evaluation
9 executing unit retains information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath when the
10 XPath is partially established upon the evaluation of the XPath using the document tree."

11 Thus claim 9 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 8.

12 *With respect to claim 10, Peng teaches an information processing apparatus*
13 *comprising: an XML parser for analyzing an XML document to be processed and thereby*
14 *generating XML event strings (page 433,[12.1]); an XPath evaluating unit for serially*
15 *inputting the XML event strings generated by the XML parser and evaluating the Xpath*
16 *with respect to each of inputted XML events by streaming processing (page 433, 1st of*
17 *[3.], "PDA"); and an application executing unit for inputting the XML events generated*
18 *by the XML parser and performing processing with respect to the XML document*
19 *configured by the XML events in response to an evaluation result of the XPath by the*
20 *Xpath evaluating unit (page 434, [3.2], "building the BPDT"), wherein the XPath*
21 *evaluating, unit serially evaluates the XPath with respect to each of the XML events,*
22 *retains information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath when the*
23 *XPath is partially established with respect to a given XML event, and judges that the*
24 *XPath is established with respect to the XML document when the last step of the XPath is*
25 *established.*

26 In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office
27 communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does
28 not allude to or anticipate Claim 1, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also not
29 concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 10. A review of the referenced portions
30 failed to show the alleged equivalency.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a combination of elements as in claim 10. Peng does not combine and/or does not have an XML parser, an XPath evaluating unit and an application executing unit of claim 10.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate an apparatus wherein an "XPath evaluating unit serially evaluates the XPath with respect to each of the XML events, retains information concerning a result of partial evaluation of the XPath when the XPath is partially established with respect to a given XML event, and judges that the XPath is established with respect to the XML document when the last step of the XPath is established."

Thus claim 10 is allowable over Peng.

Claim 11 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 10 and furthermore Peng teaches the information processing apparatus, wherein the XPath evaluating unit generates an automaton for expressing the XPath to be evaluated, performs partial evaluation of the Xpath by allowing transition of a state of the automaton based on the XML events generated by the XML parser, and retains a result of the partial evaluation as the state of the automaton (example 1 and last paragraph of page 432, when author element in input stream is encountered, Xpath is evaluated, and it satisfied the path (pub/book/author. However, book element, author elements are buffered to wait for later input stream events process).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that exception is also taken with this office communication statement. Firstly, it was shown that Peng is certainly not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 10, or any partial evaluation of an XPath. Peng also is also not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate Claim 11. A review of the referenced portions fail to show the alleged equivalency.

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a limitation of "wherein the XPath evaluating unit generates an automaton for expressing the XPath to be evaluated."

Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a limitation of "performs partial evaluation of the XPath by allowing transition of a state of the automaton based on the XML

events generated by the XML parser, and retains a result of the partial evaluation as the state of the automaton."

Thus claim 11 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 10.

Claim 12 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 10 and furthermore Peng teaches the information processing apparatus, wherein the XPath evaluating unit generates a first stack which expresses the XPath to be evaluated with a string of stack elements, generates a second stack for analyzing a nested structure of the XML document to be processed based on the XML events generated by the XML parser, and performs partial evaluation of the XPath by then comparing the first stack with the second stack (page 433, 1st paragraph of [3.], lines 5-10).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that it was shown that Peng does not anticipate claim 10. Peng does not anticipate claim 12. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a limitation of "wherein the XPath evaluating unit serially constructs a document tree indicating a document structure of the XML document to be processed based on inputted XML events along with the input of the respective XML events generated by the XML parser, and evaluates the XPath by use of the document tree with a part which has been constructed."

Thus claim 12 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 10.

Claim 13 is rejected for the reasons set forth hereinabove for claim 10 and furthermore Peng teaches the information processing apparatus, wherein the XPath evaluating unit serially constructs a document tree indicating a document structure of the XML document to be processed based on inputted XML events along with the input of the respective XML events generated by the XML parser, and evaluates the XPath by use of the document tree with a part which has been constructed (page 436, 1st paragraph of [4.], "hierarchical pushdown transducer (HPDT), inform of a binary tree"; figure 11, and 1st paragraph of 14.2], build an HPDT from an Xpath query).

In response, the applicants respectfully state that it was shown that Peng does not anticipate claim 10. Peng does not anticipate claim 13. Peng is not concerned with, does not allude to or anticipate a limitation of "wherein the XPath evaluating unit serially constructs a document tree indicating a document structure of the XML document to be processed based on inputted XML events along with the input of the respective XML events generated by the XML parser, and

evaluates the XPath by use of the document tree with a part which has been constructed." Thus claim 13 is allowable over Peng for itself and because it depends on claim 10.

Claim 14 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1. The claim 1 claims limitations of the XPath evaluating method while the claim 14 claims limitations of a program causing the computer to execute the procedure for carrying out the steps of claim 1.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 1, claim 14 for a program to do the steps of claim 1 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 1.

Claim 15 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1. The claim 1 claims limitations of the XPath evaluating method while the claim 15 claims limitations of an article of manufacture comprising computer readable program code means for causing a computer to effect the steps of claim 1.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 1, claim 1 for an article of manufacture to do the steps of claim 1 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 1.

Claim 16, and 17 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1. The claim 1 claims limitations of the XPath evaluating method while the claims 16, 17 claim limitations of a program storage device readable by machine to perform the steps of claim 1.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 1, claims 16 and 17 for a program storage device to do the steps of claim 1 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 1.

Claim 18 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 5. The claim 5 claims limitations of the XPath evaluating apparatus while the claim 18 claims limitations of a computer program product for causing a computer to effect the Xpath evaluating apparatus of claim 5.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 5, claim 18 for a program product to do the functions of claim 5 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 5.

Claim 19 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 9. The claim 8 claims limitations of the XPath evaluating apparatus while the claim 19

claims limitations of a computer program product for causing a computer to effect the Xpath evaluating apparatus of claim 8.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 8, claim 19 for a program product to do the functions of claim 8 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 8.

Claim 20 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 10. The claim 10 claims limitations of the information processing apparatus while the claim 20 claims limitations of a computer program product for causing a computer to effect the information processing apparatus of claim 10.

In response, the applicants respectfully state that indeed as with claim 10, claim 20 for a program product to do the functions of claim 10 is allowable because it depends on allowable claim 10.

It is anticipated that this amendment brings claims 1-20. If any questions remain, please call the undersigned before issuing a FINAL office communication.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper to deposit account 50-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____/Louis Herzberg/_____
Dr. Louis P. Herzberg
Reg. No. 41,500
Voice Tel. (845) 352-3194
Fax. (845) 352-3194

3 Cloverdale Lane
Monsey, NY 10952

Customer Number: 54856